

ENF

**Environmental
Notification Form**

For Office Use Only
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs

EOEA No.: 12833
MEPA Analyst: Andrea Dames
Phone: 617-626-1028

The information requested on this form must be completed to begin MEPA Review in accordance with the provisions of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, 301 CMR 11.00.

Project Name: Oakmount in Milford II		
Street: East Main Street, Route 16		
Municipality: Milford	Watershed: Charles	
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates:	Latitude: 42 09' 48" Longitude: 71 29' 15"	
Estimated commencement date: 9/02	Estimated completion date: 9/8	
Approximate cost: \$8,000,000	Status of project design:	90 %complete
Proponent: Einar Paul & Joyce Robsham		
Street: P.O. Box 5151		
Municipality: Cochituate	State: MA	Zip Code: 01778
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Peter M. Lavoie		
Firm/Agency: Guerriere & Halnon, Inc.	Street: 333 West Street	
Municipality: Milford	State: MA	Zip Code: 01757
Phone: 508-473-6630	Fax: 508-473-8243	E-mail: plavoie@guerriereand

Does this project meet or exceed a mandatory EIR threshold (see 301 CMR 11.03)?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Has this project been filed with MEPA before?

☐ Yes (EOEA No. _____)

☒ No

Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA before?

☐ Yes (EOEA No. _____)

☒ No

Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.05(7)) requesting:

a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8))

☐ Yes

☒ No

a Special Review Procedure? (see 301 CMR 11.09)

☐ Yes

☒ No

a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.11)

☐ Yes

☒ No

a Phase I Waiver? (see 301 CMR 11.11)

☐ Yes

☒ No

Identify any financial assistance or land transfer from an agency of the Commonwealth, including the agency name and the amount of funding or land area (in acres): N/A

Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency?

☐ Yes (Specify _____) ☒ No

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: Planning Board, Notice of Intent, Board of Health
Building Permits, Massachusetts Highway Curb Cut, Water Quality

Which ENF or EIR review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03):

- | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land | <input type="checkbox"/> Rare Species | <input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Wastewater | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Air | <input type="checkbox"/> Solid & Hazardous Waste |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ACEC | <input type="checkbox"/> Regulations | <input type="checkbox"/> Historical & Archaeological Resources |

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits & Approvals
LAND				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order of Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Superceding Order of Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Chapter 91 License <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 401 Water Quality Certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MHD or MDC Access Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Water Management Act Permit <input type="checkbox"/> New Source Approval <input type="checkbox"/> DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/Extension Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Other Permits <i>(including Legislative Approvals) – Specify:</i> <u>PLANNING BOARD</u> <u>BOARD OF HEALTH</u>
Total site acreage	120+/-			
New acres of land altered		49+/-		
Acres of impervious area	0	11.7	11.7	
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		14,563+/-		
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		N/a		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		N/a		
STRUCTURES				
Gross square footage	0	130,680	130,680	
Number of housing units	0	69	69	
Maximum height (in feet)	0	18'	18'	
TRANSPORTATION				
Vehicle trips per day	0	750	750	
Parking spaces	N/a	N/a	N/a	
WATER/WASTEWATER				
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use		30,360	30,360	
GPD water withdrawal		30,360	30,360	
GPD wastewater generation/treatment		N/a	N/a	
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)		1.35	1.35	

CONSERVATION LAND: Will the project involve the conversion of public parkland or other Article 97 public natural resources to any purpose not in accordance with Article 97?

☐ Yes (Specify _____) ☒ No

Will it involve the release of any conservation restriction, preservation restriction, agricultural preservation restriction, or watershed preservation restriction?

☐ Yes (Specify _____) ☒ No

RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated Habitat of Rare Species, Vernal Pools, Priority Sites of Rare Species, or Exemplary Natural Communities?

☒ Yes (Specify Spotted Turtle and Blue Spotted Salamander) ☐ No

HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does the project site include any structure, site or district listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth?

☐ Yes (Specify _____) ☒ No

If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction of any listed or inventoried historic or archaeological resources?

☐ Yes (Specify _____) ☒ No

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is the project in or adjacent to an Area of Critical Environmental Concern?

☐ Yes (Specify _____) ☒ No

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description should include (a) a description of the project site, (b) a description of both on-site and off-site alternatives and the impacts associated with each alternative, and (c) potential on-site and off-site mitigation measures for each alternative (*You may attach one additional page, if necessary.*)

The project is a 69 lot residential subdivision to be constructed on 1 120+/- acre parcel of land situated in the northern section of the town of Milford near the border with Holliston. The project will require the construction of 7,111 linear feet of roadway with associated utilities and grading. The area is zoned for rural residential (RC) with 45,000 s.f. lots with 120 feet of frontage and 140 feet of lot width.

Alternatives included a smaller project or a no build alternative.

1. A smaller project was rejected due to financial viability. This site has a potential for more than the proposed number of lots as shown, if the entire parcel were usable. However due to the presence of large wetland area, topography and the presence of rare speices the project size was reduced to provide a resonable lot configuration and lot size. Many of the lots will have a greater lot size then required as well as lot frontage. Also a smaller project could not significantly decrease the amount of road construction needed for safe vehicular traffic. The milford town engineer and planner agreed that this project would be final development in this area due to abutting zoning and wetlands. The Milford subdivision regulation states that you have to give access to any lot abutting the project can not create a land lock piece of land. Thus construction cost will not be significantly reduced, making a smaller project unfeaseable.

2. The "No Build Alternative" will not provide the housing stock needed in the town of Milford area. Also it is not financially feasible to leavethis property in it's present undeveloped state.